

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1994

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1994

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, today my colleague SHERRY BOEHLERT, the ranking Republican on the subcommittee, and I are introducing the Water Quality Act of 1994.

A lot of work by a lot of people has gone into the writing of this bill. The bill reauthorizes, and substantially rewrites, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, also known as the Clean Water Act, an enormously important and complex piece of legislation.

This is one of the bills President Clinton highlighted as must-pass legislation for 1994 in his State of the Union Address just a few weeks ago.

Water pollution is one of the most important issues in American life. It determines a large part of our quality of life, our health and well-being, our supply of drinking water, the kinds of recreational opportunities we have, a significant part of our food supply, where we can locate new businesses, whether we can accommodate growth, and what kind of a world our children will inherit from us.

Ninety-seven percent of all water on our planet is saline, and 2 percent is frozen. We depend on that last 1 percent to sustain all human life and economic activity on Earth. And that amount of fresh water available to us has not changed in the entire history of human beings on Earth. World population is 10 times today what it was 300 years ago, and we are now doubling the population every 40 years. Yet we have no more fresh water on this planet than we had when our ancestors still lived in caves.

The task of sustaining more and more of us, and at a higher and higher standard of living, on an unchanged amount of fresh water, is more and more of a challenge, and requires more and more effort on our part. There are more of us, creating more pollution at the same time we need more unpolluted water than ever before. And there is no substitute for water; there is no alternative to water.

This is a challenge which is central to our lives and to the lives of our children. In the United States our attempt to meet this challenge has centered on the Clean Water Act, which regulates the pollution of our Nation's waters so that we can all continue to be sustained by the water available to us. That act has been in place for over 20 years, and it has accomplished a great deal.

Lake Erie, which was once declared dead, today supports a thriving recreational fishing industry. There is no longer the fear of the Cuyahoga River catching fire. And in virtually any weather, people can be seen fishing in the Potomac River within a few miles of the

Capitol, something that 25 years ago would have been unthinkable and foolhardy.

But despite these success, the water quality goals we set for ourselves in 1972 have not been reached.

Our efforts in the early years of the act focused on the worst problems of that time—point source pollution from factories and cities. And substantial progress has been made in two decades on the problems of point source pollution. But as a result, the nature of the pollution threat we face has changed. The Environmental Protection Agency's most recent report to Congress tells us that the largest single category of pollution into our Nation's waters is now nonpoint source pollution: the runoff which enters our waters following a rainstorm and brings with it pollution from our farmlands, forestry areas, urbanized areas, and so on.

We have done relatively little so far to deal with this type of pollution. While additional pollution reduction can be achieved from point sources, it is increasingly difficult and expensive to get substantial reductions in this area, since we have already removed most of the pollutants from the point sources. The fact is that if we are ever to reach our 1972 goals of fishable and swimmable water throughout our country, nonpoint source pollution must be addressed—and successfully.

The bill being introduced today has two central goals: to further reduce water pollution in this country, and to do it in a way which imposes the least possible burdens consistent with getting the job done. And we cannot accomplish both these goals without addressing nonpoint pollution, since this is the area where the most pollution reduction, at the least cost, can be achieved.

Our bill would require the States to have their own nonpoint source pollution plans, which they could tailor to fit their own needs and priorities, but which would have to be sufficient to enable us to meet water quality standards in our streams, rivers, and lakes. The States would be required to make these plans legally enforceable like other State laws or regulations. We would also substantially increase the funding available to States to help them do nonpoint pollution work, more than doubling the funding levels over the life of the authorization. We would also clarify that the nonpoint plans and programs were intended to cover both rural and urban watershed runoff problems.

Closely related to nonpoint pollution control is watershed planning. In many areas State and local governments lack the flexibility to achieve needed pollution reductions in the most cost-effective way, because they often cannot balance pollution reductions from one source against pollution reductions from another source. Watershed planning is designed to give them the tools they now lack. First of all, States would not be required to designate watersheds, but they would be authorized to do so where they believed it would be helpful.

Second, once the watershed were designated, all point-source permits within that watershed, as well as the nonpoint source and watershed planning cycles in that watershed, would be made to coincide on the same 5-year intervals. In this way, the State would be able to make trade-offs between point sources, and between point and nonpoint sources, in order to achieve water quality standards in the watershed in the most efficient, least burdensome way. And third, we intend to provide a mechanism by which the various sources of pollution within a watershed could transfer between themselves some or all of the pollution they are allowed to discharge, so long as such transfers would be consistent with our water quality objectives throughout the watershed. We have not included this mechanism in the introduced bill, because we are still working on it to assure that it does what needs to be done. We expect to add this provision to the bill during markup.

Many of the features of the 1972 act affect municipalities as the operators of sewage treatment works. The cost of cleaning up municipal sewage discharges through improved and expanded treatment has been and will continue to be very great. Despite all the expenditures of the past two decades, EPA recently estimated total water pollution control needs at the local level to be in excess of \$137 billion. The cost of doing that work has always been primarily a local responsibility, but the Federal Government has in past years been a significant contributor of the funding to do this federally required work. In the late 1970's the annual funding to this effort peaked at about \$7 billion per year; it has been in decline ever since. The Reagan and Bush administrations cut this funding back to \$2 billion per year, as well as converting it from a grant program to a loan program.

The Clinton administration came in on a wave of promises about increased environmental cleanup and increased infrastructure investment, but this key program has seen neither. The already slashed Reagan-Bush funding levels were further cut to \$1.2 billion in fiscal year 1994. The administration recently proposed a level of \$1.6 billion per year in fiscal year of 1995 and they propose phasing the program out entirely after the late 1990's. The reasoning given for the phase out is that by the late 1990's the loan funds in each of the States—State revolving funds—would be sufficiently capitalized to go on thereafter making loans at the \$2 billion per year rate.

However, the reality here is that a \$2 billion per year program will never make a dent in needs which are \$137 billion and constantly growing. The fact is that the Federal Government has been reduced to being a very minor contributor to the solution to this very large pollution problem, and it is trying to become a noncontributor.

That is not right.

The Federal Government interest and role in cleaning up water pollution, which flows back

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

and forth across State boundaries, is sufficient for the Federal Government to play a very substantial regulatory role through the Clean Water Act. And the Federal Government interest and role is sufficient for the Federal Government to contribute a meaningful part of the municipal costs of that cleanup.

Our bill therefore proposes a substantial increase in the Federal Government's contributions to the capitalization of the State revolving funds: to \$3 billion in fiscal year 1995 and an increase of a half a billion dollars per year thereafter.

We would also allow State and local governments increased flexibility in utilizing the limited SRF dollars available to them. In particular, we would remove the existing 20 percent restriction on the use of SRF loans for combined sewer overflows and collector sewers. It makes no sense to tell a community whose greatest pollution problem is CSO's that it will be most restricted in the use of SRF money if it attempts to deal with its greatest problem.

Another flexibility feature which is perhaps one of the most important provisions of the bill is the new hardship communities provision.

At present, the SRF loan program works very well and gets multiple uses out of each Federal dollar contributed to the SRF's. However, the limitation of this approach has been that the communities with the greatest needs relative to their economic capability are precisely those communities least likely to be able to repay an SRF loan and therefore do not get the loan in the first place. This has denied SRF support to some of the communities which most need it.

We can preserve the benefits of the SRF mechanism while solving its limitations by giving the SRF special features which apply to hardship communities, and that is exactly what the bill would do. The bill provides that when a community's wastewater treatment costs exceed 1.25 percent of median family income in that community, special hardship features of the SRF come into play. These features are that the maximum allowed term of the loan would be extended from 20 to 30 years, and that interest rates, which now cannot be less than zero, would be allowed to be negative. The States would have the flexibility to use any combination of longer terms and lower rates necessary to get the cost burden as low as 1.25 percent of median family income.

While in some cases the beneficiaries of this hardship community provision might be large communities with unusually high costs to meet water quality goals, in most cases the beneficiaries will be smaller communities, for which the costs of compliance are often disproportionately high because the economies of scale work against them. This provision should be a significant help in bringing many smaller communities into compliance with water quality requirements.

Another provision designed to make the SRF work better—despite its limited resources—at meeting the water pollution needs all across our country would be to revise the allocation formula to better reflect current needs. The current formula is based on needs assessments and population data from the mid and late 1970's and no longer reflects the needs we know of today. We are still at work on that revised allocation formula, and so it is

not included in the bill as introduced. However, we expect to add a new allocation formula to the bill in the near future.

Another issue with respect to getting the greatest possible benefits out of the SRF program is the encouragement of treatment technologies and designs which are more efficient and less costly. Our review of this issue showed that the greatest problem facing particularly smaller communities considering innovative or alternative technologies was lack of knowledge and certainty that these alternatives would meet pollution reduction requirements. The bill therefore would require EPA to publish a report, and update it annually, on innovative and alternative technologies. This should serve as a central clearinghouse for information about these technologies and about their performance where they have been constructed.

In recent years there has been a tendency to make site-specific funding available in a few chosen locations, while leaving the basic program to wither away. In some cases these site-specific actions were justified on the grounds that the basic program was not well-designed to accomplish that particular project. For example, for many CSO projects, often a key part of estuary cleanup and urban watershed problems, a key problem was the 20 percent limitation on the use of SRF's for CSO work. We are removing that limitation. Similarly, communities with very high treatment costs argued that the SRF loan program imposed unduly high cost burdens on their citizens. The hardship community provisions in this bill are designed to address that problem.

In short, our approach has been to solve the problems which have inclined some communities to seek funding separate from the program. We want the program itself to be the vehicle for addressing water pollution problems, and we want the program to be reinvigorated and expanded. Therefore, we are ending in this bill the practice of making site-specific funding for projects. This is being accomplished through a phaseout of existing funding for projects. The fiscal year 1994 appropriations bill has already appropriated \$500 million, subject to the designation of the locations by this bill. We make those designations in this bill, and we have done so on the basis of funding the kinds of projects which have been getting funding in the past few years and which were therefore relying on it. However, as a general rule we will expect these projects in the future to participate in the basic SRF program and not to receive separate site-specific funding.

Projects receiving the fiscal year 1994 funding are, first, the coastal communities group, which are cities which face very high secondary treatment costs because they deferred secondary treatment while pursuing the secondary waiver option, ultimately did not obtain that waiver, and have not committed through consent agreements or similar means to achieve secondary treatment under relatively demanding schedules. Second, the Rough River Project in Michigan, which is primarily a CSO project and which has received separate funding in each of the past few years. And third is the establishment of a fund to help deal with the very serious problems of the Colonias.

One of the most important benefits of this bill, both to communities and to the environment, is in the flexibility the bill would create with respect to CSO's and stormwater. The administration estimates the cost savings of these two provisions at about \$30 billion, yet neither would diminish our water quality goals.

Existing law will require stormwater drains in many instances to be dealt with through very expensive treatment systems designed to achieve numeric standards. However, it is not clear whether that degree of burden will prove necessary to deal with stormwater pollution, and the likelihood is for greater conflict than cleanup. This bill therefore requires larger communities to move ahead with management practices, rather than treatment facilities, to deal with stormwater pollution, and assures that the stormwater problems of smaller communities will be dealt with through the nonpoint source program. It would then be determined whether those measures were in fact sufficient to achieve water quality standards, and if so, treatment facilities would not be required.

Similarly, CSO needs facing some cities are enormous. EPA has identified needs of over \$41 billion. Yet questions of how much storage capacity will really be needed to meet water quality objectives are often hotly debated. Consistent with EPA's new CSO policy, we would allow cities to move ahead with the portion of the work is clearly necessary, and then judge whether additional work is required to meet water quality.

An issue which has been of particular interest is the issue of chlorine. The administration recently proposed an in-house study of chlorine and the advisability of restricting or banning its use, and also proposed a broader National Academy of Sciences study. While the first of those two studies has been quite controversial, it does not require any legislative action and we have included none in this bill. We have authorized the NAS study, which would take a broader look at many different kinds of chemicals which may have certain specific health effects.

The bill contains a number of other important features, among them a general strengthening of enforcement of water pollution laws, changes in EPA's process for dealing with toxics to make that process less cumbersome, creation of pollution prevention plans at larger companies, and greater scrutiny of water pollution emanating from Federal facilities.

One issue the bill does not deal with at this point is wetlands. We are still considering how best to approach that issue.

Mr. Speaker, in sum, this bill will further reduce pollution and will accomplish that in a way that involves the least possible additional burden. While a great deal of work remains to be done, this bill is a major step forward.

We will not be holding any additional hearings, since the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee held extensive hearings over the past 3 years. We will, however, allow a period of 2 weeks for written comment. So as not to lose momentum, I specifically request that any comments be submitted in writing to the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee within 2 weeks.

CLEAN WATER ACT
REAUTHORIZATION

HON. SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1994

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to express my strong support for the Water Quality Act of 1994.

Today we are taking a critical step toward meeting the clean water challenges now before our Nation. The Water Quality Act of 1994 sets out to improve the quality of our waters through placing greater emphasis and resources into the prevention of nonpoint sources of pollution, and by providing increased funding and greater flexibility for States working to improve their waters. When addressing America's clean water needs, estimated by EPA to be in the neighborhood of \$137 billion, we must apply our limited resources where they will have the greatest positive impact. I believe the Water Quality Act of 1994 will effectively address our Nation's clean water needs and I am pleased to be the original cosponsor of this measure.

Over the past two decades the Clean Water Act has been the catalyst for significant improvements in the quality of our lakes, streams, and rivers. The wastewater treatment facilities that have been constructed with Clean Water Act funds are preventing tons of harmful pollutants from entering our waters every hour of every day. America's industries have also made enormous reductions in the quantity of toxics that are discharged into our waters, and their efforts should be recognized.

However, America's waters are now facing new and often more elusive threats. Recent studies indicate that nonpoint sources of pollution are now responsible for over half of all pollutants in the Nation's surface waters. The Water Quality Act of 1994 acknowledges this fact, and shifts the focus of the Clean Water Act to meet this challenge.

The measure introduced today established a new section of the Clean Water Act entitled "State Watershed Management Programs." Under this section of the bill States will be encouraged to use a watershed-holistic approach to managing their waters. The impacts of point and nonpoint sources of pollution will be looked at together—not as separate unrelated entities as is often the case today. Through this approach, resource application and pollution regulation can be better tuned to maximize water quality and minimize cost.

The authorized funding levels for State nonpoint source programs will be more than doubled and State revolving fund [SRF] monies will also be eligible for nonpoint source initiatives within designated watersheds. Nonpoint sources of pollution are a significant part of the water quality equation and funding levels should reflect this reality.

The Water Quality Act of 1994 also provides States with the funding and flexibility required to achieve their clean water objectives. The funding levels authorized for the SRF will be increased to \$3 billion in fiscal year 1995 and will increase by \$500 million annually through the year 2000. The SRF approach to funding water infrastructure has been an invaluable

tool in meeting clean water goals. Our bill continues to support the SRF with modifications designed to assure that small communities and poorer communities can participate in this loan program.

The clean water proposal being introduced today will also bring needed regulatory relief in the areas of storm water and combined sewer overflows. These changes reflect our concern that tax dollars be spent where they will achieve the greatest water quality improvement.

Arguably, no resource regulated by the Federal Government has a greater impact then water on the day-to-day lives of all Americans. Assuring that our Nation's surface waters are safe for human uses, commercial uses, and wildlife is a challenge that must be met.

Chairman MINETA has done an excellent job in crafting an effective Clean Water Act reauthorization package and I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

CHINA MFN

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1994

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let the record show that the Clinton administration is already trying to wiggle out of its commitment to cut off MFN for China 3 months before the deadline. Already twice this week, the administration has signaled that it is willing to abandon its own conditions that it imposed on China last year.

First the administration said that it is willing to consider multiyear extensions of MFN if China meets the conditions. But as this Washington Post article shows, now the administration is willing to accept words, not deeds, from the Chinese Government. Unfortunately, this was predictable, and I did just that last year upon the issuance of the President's Executive order. The administration is obviously desperate to continue MFN.

Mr. Speaker, this administration's foreign policy has reached pathetic depths. Time and again, on issue after issue, we see that the Clinton administration simply does not have the will to stand up for American interests. They are simply terrified of ruffling even a single feather in any other nation.

This is not the kind of leadership that won the cold war, Mr. Speaker. And it is not the kind of solidarity that the slaves who are the Chinese people expect from America.

I would like to submit the Washington Post article for the RECORD.

U.S. SHIFTS BENCHMARKS FOR RIGHTS IN
CHINA

(By Lena H. Sun)

BEIJING, March 2—The United States has told China that Beijing may be able to show some of the human rights progress needed to retain its nonrestrictive trading status with Washington through pledges rather than specific actions, a senior U.S. official said today.

The development comes as the annual debate over China's most-favored-nation trading status is beginning in Congress. Sec-

retary of State Warren Christopher is to come here next week for further discussions.

In Washington, Christopher suggested that the United States might be willing to consider future multi-year extensions of trade benefits if Beijing improves human rights in the next few months.

Both sides are trying to find a way for Washington to renew Beijing's trading privileges critical for both countries, while promoting human rights in China. Most-favored-nation status grants a country trading privileges equal to those granted all other trade partners not being subjected to punitive treatment.

While John Shattuck, assistant secretary of state for human rights, was talking with Chinese officials, visiting Undersecretary of Commerce Jeffrey Garten told reporters that China is the world's biggest emerging market and that he has been lobbying on behalf of American companies for projects valued at about \$6 billion.

Last year, President Clinton made extension of China's trade status conditional on "significant, overall progress" in several human rights areas. Administration officials have not disclosed how progress is to be measured, but in his two days of "very detailed and very precise" talks here, Shattuck said, he outlined a bottom line for his Chinese counterparts.

Shattuck, who is on his second trip here, declined to characterize China's position on further human rights gestures.

According to a senior U.S. official, the gestures the Americans are looking for include:

A public commitment by China to subscribe to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

A public commitment to ensure humane treatment of prisoners by allowing access to prisons by international humanitarian organizations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross. China is having discussions with the Red Cross about prison visits, but the U.S. official said it would be "unreasonable" to expect any visits to take place before June 3, when Clinton must make his trade-status decision;

A public commitment by Beijing for high-level discussions between Chinese authorities and the Dalai Lama, the spiritual leader of Tibet.

In addition, Washington also wants to see China take concrete steps to ban exports to the United States of goods made with prison labor; stop jamming Voice of America broadcasts; allow free emigration; account for more than 300 political and religious prisoners; and release an estimated 20 ill detainees whom the United States considers "priority cases."

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF
HOUSE RESOLUTION 343 TO CON-
DEMN A SPEECH BY A SENIOR
REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NA-
TION OF ISLAM

HON. DICK SWETT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1994

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] for introducing House Resolution 343, which condemns a viciously anti-Semitic and racist speech recently given at Kean College in New

Jersey by Khalid Abdul Muhammad, who at the time was national spokesman for the Nation of Islam. This resolution also condemns all manifestations of racism, anti-Semitism, and bigotry. This resolution deals with an issue of grave importance for the Congress and for all of the American people.

It is essential, Mr. Speaker, that the House of Representatives condemn this anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic, and blatantly bigoted speech given by Mr. Muhammad. If we do not vote to denounce these repugnant remarks, we will be party to fostering the religious, ethnic, and racial intolerance that is incited by this speech and others like it.

Some have argued that we should not engage in the symbolic act of condemning this offensive speech because of its impact upon the first amendment to our Constitution. There is no question that symbols are important. On the one hand, we have a speech that symbolizes hatred, division, derision, violence, and disrespect for others. On the other hand, we have a resolution, which symbolically condemns such divisive and repulsive speech, and which we hope will bring our communities and our Nation together with greater respect and tolerance for the diversity that gives strength to our great Nation.

It is essential for this Congress to take upon itself the responsibility of bringing clearly to the public's attention the intolerance, anti-Semitism, anti-Catholic, antiwhite, and racist bigotry that oozes from Abdul Muhammad's speech. If we recognize his right under the first amendment of our Constitution to make such a vile and odious speech, we must also admit that we have the right—and the obligation—to condemn that speech.

We are not passing laws today to restrict the precious freedom of speech, and we are not taking action against the Nation of Islam or any of its members. We are not doing anything but making a statement that these symbols of hatred, division, and derision cannot be tolerated and must be condemned.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember that words lead to action—they are not spoken in a vacuum. Mr. Muhammad gave that speech to move his audience to action, to move that auditorium of young college students to make decisions and to take action. We need only look at what is happening in our Nation to see the consequences of such action, the consequences of bigoted, racist, hate-inciting speech.

Last year, in 1993, the Anti-Defamation League reported 1,867 incidents of anti-Semitism in 44 States and the District of Columbia—the second highest number reported in the 15 years that the ADL has kept records of such incidents. This represents an increase of 8 percent over the previous year. These incidents include verbal and physical harassment, desecration of holy places, Holocaust revisionism on college campuses, and even firebombings of Jewish day schools. Mr. Speaker, calling Jews "the bloodsuckers of the black people" only serves to inspire hatred and to encourage still more incidents of this type.

As long as these coals of hatred continue to burn, and as long as there are racists like Khalid Muhammad who are eager and willing to fan those coals of hatred into flames of vio-

lence and racist action, it is essential that we in the Congress speak out clearly and unequivocally in opposition. We are a nation of immigrants, many of whom came here to escape the religious, ethnic, or racial persecution of their homelands. We are a richly diverse country, and we must teach and live the message of tolerance if we are to enjoy domestic tranquility.

During World War II, the Nazi German leadership turned the Jews, Gypsies, homosexuals, the disabled, and other minority groups into scapegoats for uncertain economic, political, and social conditions in Germany. No one in this Chamber needs to be reminded of where that policy led. Given the serious economic and social problems afflicting many of our Nation's inner cities today, Mr. Muhammad's and Mr. Farrakhan's agenda of hate and blame and scapegoating can only increase the likelihood of violence and racial tensions.

In 1838 Abraham Lincoln spoke these words:

All the armies of Europe, Asia and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth in the military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years. * * * If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time, or die by suicide.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not stand up and condemn these kinds of statements, if we do not make a symbol of this speech and say, "We cannot tolerate this kind of speech in this country," we surely will bring about the suicide of our Nation.

I strongly support the resolution that was introduced and brought before the House of Representatives by my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

KEY DOCUMENTS PROVE INNOCENCE OF JOSEPH OCCHIPINTI

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1994

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, as part of my continuing efforts to bring to light all the facts in the case of former Immigration and Naturalization Service agent Joseph Occhipinti, I submit into the RECORD a copy of a letter that was written by John McAllister of the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force in New York City to Staten Island, NY, Borough president, Guy Molinari, regarding a key witness in the Federal Government's case against Mr. Occhipinti:

ORGANIZED CRIME DRUG
ENFORCEMENT TASK FORCE,
New York, NY.

MR. MOLINARI,
Staten Island Borough President, Borough Hall,
Staten Island, NY.

DEAR SIR: As per our telephone conversation, these are the facts as I remember them pertaining to the conversations that I had with Special Agent Wai Ng and AUSA Steven Standeford concerning an incident at a Chi-

nese massage parlor. I am not sure when this incident is supposed to have occurred, but it is my understanding that it was when S/A Wai Ng worked for me in the Special Operations section of investigations. But by the time that I received his phone call Ng no longer worked in my unit.

As I recall, I received a telephone call from S/A Ng sometime in mid June 1991. As soon as I answered the phone Ng said "I know that you don't remember, I know you don't remember, I know you don't remember but I told you about the incident that occurred during an investigation at a Chinese massage parlor with Occhipinti".

Ng went on to say "At one point during the raid Occhipinti wanted me to translate what he was saying to the madam of the parlor. Joe Occhipinti told me to tell the madam that if she did not allow us to search the parlor he would have Stafford Williams rape her". Ng said that he did not tell the woman what Occhipinti had said.

At this point in the telephone conversation I told Ng that he had never told me this story before, that this was the first time that I had ever heard of this happening. Ng stated again "I know that you don't remember but I told you about this".

Ng then told me that he had already testified in court that he has told me of the incident before.

I told Ng that if he had ever told me that story before, not only would I remember it, but that I would have had a few very strong words with both Joe Occhipinti and Stafford Williams.

The next day I had a conversation with AUSA Steven Standeford and I told him that I had spoken to Agent Ng, that Ng kept repeating that "I know you don't remember". I also told Standeford that if I were called to testify that I would state in no uncertain terms that S/A Ng had never told me this story at any time in the past. And that if he had told me this story before it was not something that I would soon forget.

JOHN MCALLISTER,
Assistant Director.

THE COLD WAR

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1994

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the House's attention to an article by Arnold Beichman in the March 1 issue of the Washington Times.

Mr. Beichman calls attention to the massive intellectual fraud being perpetrated in academia and the news media regarding the cold war. The dogmatic extremists who dominate these two debased institutions are engaged in a concerted campaign to rewrite the history of the cold war.

The campaign basically takes three tacks. The first is to deny that the Soviets were a real enemy. Another, while conceding the awful nature of Soviet communism, holds that Western policies, and especially those of Ronald Reagan, had nothing to do with the demise of the Soviet empire. And finally there is the notion, evinced by people like George Kennan, that we too, lost the cold war because we exhausted ourselves with too much defense spending.

Of course, the Kennan theory is easily dismissed. It is indeed laughable to anyone who

has ever stepped foot in a Communist country. To counter the first two notions will require vigilance, however. The truth must be told, over and over again, about the evils of communism and the policies that helped contain and ultimately defeat this evil force.

Fortunately, Mr. Beichman has added truth to the debate by quoting some rather knowledgeable sources: Russian dissidents and reformers. It turns out, Mr. Speaker, that Alexander Solzhenitsyn—who understood the cold war better than him—gives Ronald Reagan direct credit for the end of the cold war. And then we have Russian reformers, like foreign minister Andrei Kozyrev and former Moscow police chief Arkady Murashev, both of whom fully concur with Ronald Reagan's apt description of the Soviet Union as an evil empire.

It turns out, Mr. Speaker, that Ronald Reagan, the actor from Eureka College, understood the fundamental nature of communism better than most American Ph.D.'s put together.

It is important to point all of this out, Mr. Speaker. For the Clinton administration is now deeply entrenched in a foreign policy of appeasement, the precise opposite of Ronald Reagan's successful approach. This is dangerous, and must be countered at every turn.

I insert the Beichman article for the RECORD.

[From the Washington Times, Mar. 1, 1994]

AN EXILE'S COLD WAR VERDICT

"The Cold War was essentially won by Ronald Reagan when he embarked on the 'star wars' program and the Soviet Union understood that it could not take this next step."

Guess who said it? A Republican admirer of the former president? No. An ultra-right wing columnist? No. George Bush? James A. Baker? Most assuredly, no. The man who uttered this formidable finding is Alexander Solzhenitsyn. The text is to be found in a profile by David Remnick of the great Russian writer published in the Feb. 14 issue of the New Yorker.

After residing in exile for 20 years, 18 of them in the United States, the world-renowned author who made the phrase "Gulag Archipelago" synonymous with the former Soviet Union is returning to Russia in May. Should anything happen to Russian President Boris Yeltsin, let us pray that Mr. Solzhenitsyn, even though he is 75 years of age, will consider running for that post against the inevitable candidacy of the barbarous Vladimir Zhirinovsky.

The significance of Mr. Solzhenitsyn's characterization of Mr. Reagan as the architect of victory in the Cold War is that since the fall of the Berlin Wall almost five years ago—Nov. 9, 1989—there has been a campaign of denigration among U.S. academicians in history and political science of the Reagan presidency. A school of mendacious historians has arisen who either claim that "nobody" won the Cold War or else that the United States "lost" it.

Among Russian spokesmen, there is no question as to who won the Cold war and why. Arkady Murashev, onetime Moscow police chief and a leader of Democratic Russia, was quoted in New York Review as saying about Mr. Reagan: "He called us the 'Evil Empire'. So why did you in the West laugh at him? It's true." Andrei Kozyrev, Russia's foreign minister, was quoted in the Los Angeles Times as saying "the Soviet Union had really been an evil empire." He compared the

"mass crimes" under the Soviet dictatorship to the revelations about the Nazis at the Nuremberg Trials. Sergei Khrushchev, son of Nikita S. Khrushchev, on the "Larry King Show" said with a rueful smile, "Sure, you win [sic] the Cold War." And now comes the verdict of Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

Will such a verdict still the voices of the social science faculties of American universities peopled by Marxist fantasists, like Wade Huntley, assistant professor of politics at Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash.? He recently published an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education, the title of which tells all—"The United States Was the Loser in the Cold War."

Professor Fritz Stern, a distinguished Columbia historian, in a New York Times Op-Ed article derided claims that America won the Cold War:

"Without the thousands of dissidents in the Soviet Union and those in Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia who risked their lives to overthrow an ever-lying tyranny, we could not have prevailed and there would be no freedom in Eastern Europe. . . . [T]he final collapse of Soviet tyranny, unlike that of Nazism, was brought about by indigenous forces."

Professor Stern seemingly ignores 45 years of postwar history. It was American leadership—Harry Truman's—which organized the Berlin airlift in 1948 when Britain's Labor government was urging compromise with Josef Stalin, which pressed the United Nations to resist the communist invasion of South Korea, which initiated the Marshall Plan. It was American leadership—Dwight Eisenhower's—which strengthened NATO, which prodded hesitant allies in Western Europe to resist communism. And under President Reagan's leadership, America faced up to the peril of an imperialist Soviet Union by instituting an arms program, including SDI, which, as Russian commentators have now conceded, brought the former U.S.S.R. to its knees. Without the tough-minded "Reagan Doctrine," final collapse of Soviet tyranny might have been a long time coming.

For anyone not blinded by ideology, Ronald Reagan's role as architect of the bloodless victory over the former Soviet Union was luminously clear. Mr. Solzhenitsyn's verdict only confirmed what any student of contemporary history knew. So the question before us is what will the history books say in years to come about who won the Cold War and how it was done? Will the words of a Solzhenitsyn be included in the histories our children will be reading?

SANTA FE NATIONAL FOREST BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1994

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1994

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce the Santa Fe National Forest Boundary Adjustment Act of 1994. This legislation, which is also being introduced today in the Senate by my colleague JEFF BINGAMAN, would modify the boundary of the Santa Fe National Forest in my district to include the entire area of the Atalaya Mountain. The mountain, a pristine, beautiful landmark east of Santa Fe, is uniquely deserving of inclusion in the National Forest System.

The rapid growth of New Mexico's capital city in recent years has led to overcrowding, increased pollution, explosive growth into the suburbs and other impacts on the excellent quality of life in Santa Fe. In fact, a recent poll by the Journal North found that a majority of Santa Fe residents believe their city is becoming a worse place to live. The number one reason cited by poll respondents was the city's growth and development.

In addition to these concerns, recent controversies about development of housing and increased land use on Atalaya Mountain have further underscored the need for this bill. Many Santa Feans and others concerned about maintaining a proper balance between housing and development and the preservation of open and urban space saw these controversies as a symptom of a greater problem. I share this concern.

We must ensure that careful thought about where new homes and buildings are placed is an essential part of land use management planning. The wilderness belongs to everyone and it should be the responsibility of the government to protect it from misuse and the threats of development. The time has come for responsible land use planning that does not sacrifice pristine wilderness in the name of development. Such an egregious lack of self-discipline is not only threatening to the natural beauty of northern New Mexico, but it says that we care more about reckless development than the future health and sanctity of our precious natural resources.

The Santa Fe National Forest Boundary Adjustment Act simply moves a boundary to accommodate more land in the national forest, but it also marks a significant turning point for the citizens of Santa Fe and for everyone who supports responsible environmental policy. As one of my constituents said in a commentary in the Santa Fe New Mexican last month, this issue is a wake-up call. It is also a statement about our values. Passage of this legislation will mean that we value our environment. It will mean that we believe that responsible land use management should not rely on the expedient desires of growth for growth's sake and indifference to the environment.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House to ensure passage of this legislation this year.

Text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Santa Fe National Forest Boundary Adjustment Act of 1994".

SEC. 2. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

(a) EXPANSION.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall modify the boundary of the Santa Fe National Forest as depicted on the map entitled "Santa Fe National Forest Boundary Expansion—1994".

(b) MAP.—The map referred to in subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief Forester, National Forest Service, Washington, D.C.

(c) ACQUISITION.—The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire land depicted on the map described in subsection (a)

by exchange with the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—For purposes of section 7(a)(1) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-9(a)(1)), the boundary of the Santa Fe National Forest, as modified pursuant to subsection (a), shall be treated as if it were the boundary as of January 1, 1965.

SEC. 3. MANAGEMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subsection (b)(1), the Secretary of Agriculture shall not transfer by exchange, sale, or otherwise, any land or interest in land within the boundary of the Santa Fe National Forest that is acquired pursuant to the boundary expansion authorized in section 2(a).

(b) **EASEMENTS.**—

(1) **CONVEYANCE.**—The Secretary may convey to the State of New Mexico easements donated to, and accepted by, the United States.

(2) **MANAGEMENT.**—Land or interest in land acquired pursuant to the boundary expansion authorized in section 2(a) shall be managed consistent with the terms and conditions of any easement donated to, and accepted by, the United States with respect to such land or interest in land.

STATE DEPARTMENT TERRORIST AWARDS

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1994

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the State Department has just produced a new advertisement for the new program of offering up to \$2 million for information leading to the arrest of suspected terrorists.

I am proud to have successfully authored the legislation that brings this program to fruition, and I am proud that the State Department can now offer this top reward of \$2 million for information on terrorist incidents committed against U.S. interests, regardless of where in the world that they are committed.

Let us hope that this new campaign will assist in bringing the barbarians who committed the World Trade Center bombing and other such heinous acts to justice.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD the following text of the new ad:

WE WON'T STOP UNTIL THOSE RESPONSIBLE
ARE BEHIND BARS

The terrorists who bombed the World Trade Center murdered six innocent people, injured over 1,000 others, and left terrified school children trapped for hours in an elevator. Some prime suspects have been tracked down and arrested but indicted terrorists Ramzi Ahmed Yousef and Abdul Rahman Yasin remain at large. As long as they are free, more innocent lives could be at risk.

The U.S. State Department is offering rewards of up to \$2 million for information leading to their arrest.

Help us find the missing terrorists, before they find more innocent victims. If you have any information, please contact the police, the FBI, or call us at 1-800-HEROES-1. Overseas, contact the authorities or the nearest U.S. embassy. Or write: Heroes, P.O. Box 96781, Washington, DC 20090-6781, U.S.A.

CELEBRATING AFRICAN-AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1994

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in celebrating African-American History Month and express my support for the goal of empowering all members of the American community.

Today there is welcomed focus on efforts to provide all Americans with an ability to work and provide a better life for themselves and their families. The current campaign to enact health care reform addresses a basic human need for affordable health insurance. Our country is also seeking ways to ensure that families will be safe in their neighborhoods and that schools are improved so that every American can benefit from a quality education.

These goals of empowerment are especially important in the African-American community which has historically had to struggle to attain justice on a range of social and economic fronts. The history of the African-American community offers many examples of individuals and communities confronting oppression and overcoming the forces of prejudice and racial hatred.

The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette recently published an article in its Sunday magazine, The Gazette, which covered one chapter of this historic struggle for African-American empowerment. This article dealt with the history of free African-American living in the Pittsburgh area who made Pittsburgh a major stop on the Underground Railroad. These Pittsburgh African-American members of the abolitionist movement and supporters from the white community helped slaves escape to freedom in the North by way of Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania.

The story of the Underground Railroad and the abolitionist work of individuals like the free African-Americans of Pittsburgh provides an excellent example of the struggle for empowerment. It is worthwhile to remember this story because it offers inspiration for those in our modern society who seek to empower all members of the American community. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following article to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ALONG THE FREEDOM TRAIL

(By Sally Kalson)

It was a dismal day in early October—damp and chilly, with low-hanging clouds that sucked the color from the foliage and left the hillsides looking gray as February. Not the greatest weather for a bus tour, perhaps, but appropriate for the subject, which was an abolitionist tour to four sites in Pittsburgh and Washington County.

A similar day 150 years ago would have provided good conditions for escape, if you were a fugitive slave on the uncertain tracks of the Underground Railroad. Dreary weather made for good cover and kept other people home, lessening the chances of discovery.

Quite a few runaway slaves made their escapes through Western Pennsylvania. The region was a hotbed of abolitionist activity. And the Monongahela River was a convenient escape route, being among the 10 percent of the world's rivers that flow north.

On this day in 1993, a group of time travelers tried to recapture some of that history, much of it demolished, neglected or forgotten. Their guide was John Burt, a thoughtful narrator and ardent student of the region's anti-slavery past.

Burt, 47, is a downtown lawyer and adjunct faculty member at Carlow College, where he teaches history and law in the sociology department. He has been studying 19th century reform movements all his adult life. For the past decade, he's concentrated on abolition from 1830 to the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861.

"Philadelphia gets all the credit for abolition," Burt said, "mostly because they had better historians, especially the Quakers. But Pittsburgh was just as important."

Bringing that past alive is Burt's idea of a good time. And realizing how much of it has been lost to the dual wrecking balls of demolition and indifference is his idea of a shame.

Renewed interest will surely be sparked by a new school curriculum, unveiled last month by the Western Pennsylvania Historical Society, exploring local black history, including some aspects of the Underground Railroad. The society's future museum on Smallman Street will have similar displays.

Recognition of the subject's importance is recent, and in many cases there is no tangible record of the freedom trail. Yet on Burt's tour, sponsored by the Pittsburgh Peace Institute, the history takes shape.

Burt paid homage to the late Rollo Turner, one of the original members of the black studies department at the University of Pittsburgh, who had died eight days earlier at age 50. Turner was the city's recognized expert on the Underground Railroad and often gave talks on the subject.

"Rollo told me that the anti-slavery movement had a rich history here, but few people seemed to care about it. He said if I studied it, I could become an expert pretty fast."

Most slaves who made it North, Burt said, were from the northern-most part of the South. Once caught, they would be resold into the deep South, where their chances of escape were nil—unless they went way south into the Everglades, where the Seminoles provided safe haven.

"Many people don't realize that resistance to slavery goes hand-in-hand with the beginning of slavery," Burt said. About the time railroad tracks were being laid for the first steam locomotives (around 1820), slaves were disappearing from Southern plantations almost as soon as they were brought over. That led slaveholders to posit that there must be an underground railroad assisting them.

The French sheltered fugitive slaves in this territory even before the British took control in 1758, according to Carter Woodson, a black historian of the Reconstruction era. And Gen. John Forbes had blacks with him when he defeated the French and named the area Pittsburgh. These people, Burt said, formed the core of the first free black community in the nation.

This history made Pittsburgh a natural stop on the Underground Railroad, a self-help system developed largely among free blacks with the assistance of trustworthy whites.

The railroad was by necessity amorphous and secretive. Once a place developed a reputation as a safe house, it might not be safe anymore. Furthermore, a hand that offered help on Monday might take money for betrayal on Tuesday. Thus, much of the network was never documented. The history is no less real for that, but its mysterious na-

ture has lent the Underground Railroad an aura of legend and myth.

The most prominent local abolitionist organization of free blacks was the Pittsburgh Vigilance Committee, which had among its members Lewis Woodson, Martin Delaney and John B. Vashon.

Lewis Woodson (no relation to the historian) was a minister, educator, businessman and abolitionist three decades before the Emancipation Proclamation. He saw to it that his 14 children were educated and learned a trade, and opened five barber shops in Pittsburgh, all run by his sons.

Woodson became minister of the Bethel AME Church on Wylie Avenue, a safe house on the Underground Railroad. He established the Pittsburgh African Educational Society, a critical institution because black children were barred from the Pittsburgh schools until the 1850s. And under the pen name Augustine, Woodson published abolitionist articles for *The Colored American*, a black newspaper, from 1837 to 1841. Some 75 to 100 Woodson descendants live in the Pittsburgh area today.

One of Woodson's students was Martin Delaney, who became a physician, writer, scientist, army officer and explorer. He found Pittsburgh's first black newspaper, *The Mystery*, published from 1843 to 1847, and became known as the father of black nationalism.

Born in 1812 to free parents in Virginia, Delaney was sought out by the great abolitionist Frederick Douglass, himself an ex-slave, to become a partner in editing his newspaper, the *North Star*.

Delaney became famous for several distinctions. As a doctor—he was one of the first blacks admitted to Harvard Medical School—he fought the 1854 cholera epidemic in Pittsburgh. During the Civil War, he was the first black major in the U.S. Army. And after leading an expedition of American-born blacks to the Niger River valley in 1859, Delaney tried to encourage black Americans to colonize West Africa.

A historical marker honoring Delaney is at Third Avenue and Market Street, believe to be near the site where *The Mystery* was published. It was erected in 1991 by the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

The third prominent member of the Vigilance Committee was John B. Vashon, the richest black man in Pennsylvania. More about him later.

Burt noted that people in the anti-slavery movement used secret knocks, code words and signals, especially when communicating to and about fugitives. One such symbol was the jockey ornament, reviled today as a racist artifact but in its day a useful tool. When the lamp was lit, it meant the house was safe and the coast was clear. When the lamp was out, it meant stay away.

Messages were also passed along in spirituals. For example, Burt said, if a worker in the field started singing "Steal Away to Jesus," an escape attempt was probably coming. And songs about the promised land of Canaan were often cryptic references to Canada.

The abolitionist movement was the public arm of the anti-slavery struggle. At its head were committed people in positions of power or influence who denounced slavery as a blight, excoriated its proponents, and worked against it through political, religious, social and financial avenues.

The anti-slavery movement, Burt stressed, joined American blacks and whites together in a manner previously unknown. Fugitive

slaves, free blacks, everyday people of conscience, clergymen and politicians and newspaper publishers who preached abolition from their bully pulpits, wealthy citizens who financed the fight, all were united in one belief: that no nation founded on the principle that all men were created equal could tolerate slavery without sacrificing its soul.

Think of rich Pittsburgh industrialists and you'll probably think of Carnegie, Frick, Phipps, Oliver, Thaw and Mellon. The alternative view, however, has Charles Avery, a pharmaceuticals tycoon who financed a great deal of abolitionist activity across the country.

Avery is buried at the crest of a hill in Allegheny Cemetery. His grave is marked by an enormous memorial, probably 35 feet high, including a large statue of the man.

"The struggle against slavery depended on rich people of good will to donate money for newspapers and brochures," Burt said at the foot of Avery's grave. "Pittsburgh had two such people, one black, one white."

The black man was the wealthy John B. Vashon.

Born of mixed race in Carlisle, Cumberland County, Vashon headed to the western frontier of Pittsburgh after serving in the U.S. Army and quickly made money as a land developer. He built the first public baths and a barber shop on Third Street, Downtown, that became a safe station (just one example of the many Underground Railroad sites in the region that have no marker commemorating their significance).

Vashon's barber shop was also a social center and gathering place for members of the movement, local and national. Vashon was instrumental in bringing Frederick Douglass to Pittsburgh. He also got Henry Lloyd Garrison, known as the conscience of the abolitionist movement, to come here. And when Garrison needed money to publish his newspaper, *The Liberator*, in 1831, Vashon came through for him.

The white man of good will was Avery. Born in Westchester, N.Y., he came here seeking his fortune and eventually prospered in pharmaceuticals, textiles, copper and iron ore.

As a young Methodist, Avery was influenced by the strong anti-slavery stand of John Wesley that eventually split the Methodists into Northern and Southern factions. At first, he shared the belief that slaves should be returned to Africa. But after coming in contact with blacks in Pittsburgh, he realized that they were now American and began to advocate an immediate end to slavery.

His first big plunge into abolitionist waters came in 1837, when he organized local rallies to support the widow and children of an Illinois editor who was murdered for publishing an anti-slavery newspaper.

But Avery's biggest involvement revolved around the 1839 incident of the *Amistad*, a Spanish slave ship. The slaves had rebelled, killing the captain and two crew members and seizing the ship. They were picked up in Northern waters and taken to Connecticut.

Hundreds of activists rallied around the *Amistad*. Southerners demanded the slaves be hung for murder and piracy, but abolitionists saw them as heroes. In order to raise funds for their defense, Avery and other evangelical Christian abolitionists formed the American Missionary Society (it still exists today).

The lawyer they hired was none other than John Quincy Adams, who argued for 10 hours before the U.S. Supreme Court. The court

found for the slaves, ordering them set free and returned to West Africa. The decision fueled the abolitionist forces and established the AMS as a force to be reckoned with.

Avery took particular interest in a 10-year-old girl from the *Amistad*, later baptized as Sarah Kinsen. He kept in touch with her in Africa, and when she turned 18 he sent her to Oberlin College in Ohio, where she became the first international student in the history of American higher education.

Avery was also known to transport escapees personally from one site to the next. Once he dressed as his own carriage man, pulled up to a safe house, picked up some escapees and smuggled them to the next stop.

Like many abolitionists, Avery was interested in other reformist causes as well, including women's rights. As the owner of a textile plant, he employed mostly young women, ages 15 and 16. These workers became some of the earliest union agitators, but they struck Avery's plant only once. When his fellow plant-owners shut the women out, he met with them and negotiated salary increases.

When Avery died in 1856, his funeral was one of the largest the city had ever seen. The procession included huge numbers of working women and blacks, making it one of the first integrated demonstrations in Pittsburgh history.

On his grave are carvings, much the worse for age, depicting the *Amistad*, the old U.S. Supreme Court building, the fugitive slaves and John Quincy Adams.

"This next stop is for mental travelers," said Burt, standing in front of the old Blue Cross building on the corner of Smithfield Street and Fort Pitt Boulevard.

"A hundred and fifty years ago," Burt said, "this was the site of the Monongahela House, one of the finest hotels in Pittsburgh and a center of anti-slavery activity."

The Monongahela House was owned by whites, but the staff consisted of 300 free blacks. As a first-class hotel in an emerging center of commerce, it was visited by many Southern businessmen who arrived with their families and slaves—undoubtedly including cotton-growers who came to do business with Charles Avery.

While the slave-holders slept in first-class quarters upstairs, the slaves slept in the basement or the barns out back. What the whites didn't know was that three blocks away was John Vashon's barbershop. The hotel's free staff members would spirit the slaves away to Vashon's, where they received a new appearance—hairstyle, clothes, shoes—and a start on their journey to Canada.

"Rollo Turner was able to confirm that this was fact, not legend," Burt said. "Hotels used to list the names of their prominent visitors in the newspapers of the day. Rollo checked the lists against advertisements by people looking for escaped slaves. In many cases, there was a correlation."

Burt also related the delicious story of a maid who, after a visit to Vashon's barber shop, was dressed to look like a hotel staff member. She was then had through the dining room right past her owners on her way out of town. They never noticed.

The hotel's second-story balcony facing Smithfield Street made an excellent platform from which to address a large crowd, as President-elect Lincoln did in the spring of 1861. And its proximity to the river gave it strategic value on the Underground Railroad.

Between Trinity Cathedral and the First Presbyterian Church, Downtown, is the old-

est graveyard in the city of Pittsburgh. And in it are the remains of Charles P. Shiras, a young abolitionist who died at the age of 30.

The Shiras family, Burt said, established the first brewery west of the Alleghenies, on the land that is now the Point. A child of some wealth, Charlie Shiras toured Europe and worked as a journalist for the Pittsburgh Commercial Journal. He was concerned with social issues, particularly slavery, and was outspoken on the subject—especially when it came to the Fugitive Slave Bill, which was part of the 1850 Compromise.

Escaped slaves who were caught in the North had always had a right to trial. But the Compromise changed that, not only suspending the right to trial but also giving slaveholders the cooperation of federal officers in the slaves' capture. The new law yanked the security out from under Pittsburgh's black community and sent 600 people fleeing to Canada.

When Daniel Webster spoke in favor of the Compromise, it prompted John G. Whittier to write a scathing poem about him. And when the Compromise became law, Charlie Shiras wrote his own scathing poem, "The Bloodhound Song," published in the Anti-Slavery Bugle in Ohio.

"Charlie Shiras was Pittsburgh's Whittier," Burt said.

Pittsburgh saw a series of public rallies against the Compromise. At one of them, Avery said ministers who supported it should be defrocked. Martin Delaney said he would shoot dead any slave catcher who entered his home.

Charlie Shiras was also a drinking buddy of the songwriter Stephen Collins Foster. And while Foster's lyrics about "darkies" seem condescending today, they were seen as tolerant in their time. Any compassion Foster felt for black people of the day was probably due to his friendship with Shiras.

While still in his 20s, Shiras founded *The Albatross*, an abolitionist newspaper that called slavery a condemnation around the neck of the American Republic, much as its namesake was around the neck of the ancient mariner in Samuel Coleridge's poem. But the paper lasted only three months and then folded for lack of money. Shiras never had time to resurrect it before his death.

Pittsburgh's other white-published abolitionist paper was the *Pittsburgh Saturday Visitor*, founded by Jane Grey Swisshelm, one of the earliest woman journalists. Swisshelm was the first woman to get a seat in the Congressional press gallery, where she covered the debate on the Compromise of 1850.

The *Saturday Visitor* entered the arena with a devastating denouncement of a notorious case involving fugitive slaves captured in Indiana, Pa., on the farm of a Dr. Mitchell before the Compromise was passed. The slaves were brought to Pittsburgh for trial and remanded to their owners by a judge named Greer, who also fined Mitchell \$10,000 for harboring the runaways. Mitchell had to sell his farm to pay the fine, but Avery and others promptly bought it back for him.

When the first issue of the *Saturday Visitor* appeared, it bore a front-page editorial by Swisshelm attacking Judge Greer, calling him "a legal luminary now fallen 60 degrees below the moral horizon." The outraged Greer demanded an apology and threatened to jail her. On her next front page, Swisshelm published "An Apology by the Editor" that said, in essence, "I do not regret and I will not retract," and went on to berate the judge even more severely.

This running feud led to an incident related by Swisshelm in her autobiography, "Half

A Century." She wrote that two lawyers were speaking about a case one of them had before Judge Greer. The other advised him to call Swisshelm as a witness, whether she knew anything about the case, because "Greer is more afraid of her than the devil."

LeMoyné House in Washington County is one of Western Pennsylvania's best-preserved safe stations. From 1824 to 1879, it was occupied by Dr. F. Julius LeMoyné, a nationally known abolitionist and three-time candidate for governor of Pennsylvania.

"LeMoyné's political activities were very radical in his own time," Burt said.

LeMoyné financed many anti-slavery activities and corresponded with every major figure in the movement, both American and British.

The house was built in 1812 by his father, Dr. John LeMoyné, a physician who had fled the French Revolution.

He settled first in Ohio and then Washington, where he married F. Julius, the couple's only child, followed his father into medicine.

LeMoyné ran for governor as the candidate of the Liberty Party, which advocated abolition and equal education for women. After the Civil War he became an advocate of cremation, and in 1876 he built the nation's first crematorium, almost getting himself expelled from the Presbyterian church in the process.

LeMoyné's house was both a safe station and a center of anti-slavery activity. Burt said that when authorities came looking for fugitive slaves who happened to be holed up in her home, LeMoyné's wife, Medelaine, would feign illness and take to her bed—under which she would hide the escapee in question. The authorities never dared disturb the lady of the house in her boudoir.

LeMoyné kept bees on a rooftop garden. One popular story has him stationing his young son on the roof with a long pole during an important abolitionist meeting. Given a threat that a pro-slavery mob would disrupt the gathering, LeMoyné instructed his son to topple the beehives into the group. Word apparently got out, because no one ever showed up.

A wealthy man, LeMoyné donated \$10,000 toward the town hall on the condition that it include a public library for all races. The hall was razed in 1990 to make room for the Washington County Jail. He endowed LeMoyné College for free blacks in Memphis, Tenn., known today as LeMoyné-Owen College, as well as the Washington Female Seminary, which no longer exists.

LeMoyné House stayed in the family until the death of F. Julius' youngest daughter, Madeleine LeMoyné Reed, in 1943. She willed it to the Washington County Historical Society, which preserves the house much as it was when occupied by her father.

WAR CRIMES INDICTMENTS

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1994

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, last November, I made an urgent plea in this room for the immediate investigation of those alleged war criminals in the former Yugoslavia about whom the most information has already been gathered. I named many of them, men whose names have been made infamous through the

horrendous deeds they have committed, and I presented the pictures of this international most wanted list.

Unfortunately, efforts to hold such men personally accountable for their actions was slowed at the United Nations by the regrettable and untimely resignation of the Chief Prosecutor. Now, however, Graham Blewitt of Australia has been named to serve as Acting Deputy Prosecutor until the Chief Prosecutor can be replaced. In the meantime, Blewitt has the authority to proceed with indictments and trials.

I know that Mr. Blewitt has received, as I have, a copy of a model indictment prepared by Peter Thompson, working under the auspices of the Minnesota Advocates for Human Rights. It is an impressive document; I commend Mr. Thompson and the Advocates for their work on and commitment to this project, and I urge others to review their effort.

The model Mr. Thompson has drafted, which he calls a pattern indictment, draws on information already available about war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide in the Prijedor area of northwestern Bosnia. It specifies some 22 individuals, who are named by name, and it charges them with one count of conspiracy and 13 counts of committing specific crimes. It is, sadly, a gruesome bill of particulars. A number of those named, I might add, were among those whom I named in this room just a few months ago, including Simo Brljaca, Milan Kovacevic, Milomir Stakic, Zeljko Mejahic, Drazenko Predejevic, and Mladjo Krkan.

This pattern indictment for Prijedor takes the contributions of the nongovernmental community a step further: It takes the impressive information NGO's have been gathering for months and presents it in a form suitable for use in a court of law. Without a doubt, Mr. Speaker, there can be no possible excuse for the United Nation's war crimes tribunal not to proceed at this time.

There are, unfortunately, no shortage of suspects for the Acting Deputy Prosecutor to investigate. And it is certainly within his discretion to channel his energies on other cases first, if he believes that is merited. What I am most anxious to ensure is that he begin his investigations now, and issue indictments soon. Justice should be delayed no longer.

REFORM AND THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1994

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, on December 31, 1993, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which I cochaired, officially completed its work and formally expired under the terms of its authorizing resolution. All Members of Congress have received a copy of the joint committee's report, which was based on extensive hearings, roundtables, meetings, and informal discussions. My sense is that the joint committee has produced the most comprehensive and systematic study of Congress ever undertaken

by Members of this institution. If accepted, the reform recommendations in our report would substantially improve the internal operations of the House and Senate.

An undertaking of this magnitude could not have been accomplished without the assistance of many organizations and knowledgeable individuals. This is especially the case for the joint committee because we deliberately employed a small staff and even turned back more than \$300,000 from our allotted budget. People such as David Meade and Robert Weinhausen of the House Office of Legislative Counsel; James Blum, Paul Van de Water, James Horney, Glen Goodnow, and especially Phil Joyce of the Congressional Budget Office; and the House Parliamentarians—William Brown, Charles Johnson, Thomas Duncan, Muftiah McCartin, and John Sullivan—all provided exemplary advice and assistance to the joint committee.

But I particularly want to thank the Congressional Research Service for its extensive commitment of resources and talent to the joint committee. My sincere appreciation is extended to the leaders of CRS for ensuring that the joint committee received the comprehensive assistance it needed.

Most important, I thank CRS for loaning us the services of Dr. Walter Oleszek, Senior Specialist, who served as policy director for the joint committee. Walter Oleszek is well known to the Members of this body. For 25 years he has provided us with superb assistance on a wide range of procedural and organizational issues. His knowledge of the history of congressional reform is unsurpassed. As policy director for the joint committee, Walter Oleszek was involved in all facets of the joint committee's work, from assisting with efforts to create the committee to helping write our final report. His contribution was critical to the success of the joint committee.

Also detailed to the joint committee for an extended period were Carol Hardy-Vincent and Paul Rundquist. They both made outstanding contributions to the work of the committee, and to congressional reform more generally.

Special thanks also are due to the many additional CRS staffers who provided the joint committee with information and analytical support in the following areas:

Application of Laws of Congress. Charles Dale, Jay Shampansky, Vincent Treacy, and Leslie Gladstone.

Ethics Process. Jack Maskell, who worked closely with the joint committee throughout its existence, and Mildred Amer.

Committee System. Several analysts, particularly Judith Schneider and Frederick Pauls, prepared a series of committee reform plans under tight time constraints. The Government Division's support staff and the Library's graphics unit worked long hours to produce these plans and deserve our thanks. Richard Sachs, JoAnne O'Bryant, Robert Moon, Faye Bullock, Mary Tiemann, David Huckabee, and Betsy Cody also provided research advice and assistance in the committees area.

Floor Procedure and Scheduling. Rick Beth, Ilona Nickels, Stanley Bach, Stephen Stathis, Virginia McMurtry, Jon Simon, Sharon Gressle, and James Sayler.

Budget Process. James Saturno, who was detailed to the joint committee to assist on this

topic, as well as Robert Keith, Sandy Davis, Sylvia Streeter, and Jean Knezo.

Staffing Congress. Paul Dwyer, John Pontius, Adele Faber, Lorraine Tong, Frederick Pauls, Robert Sutter, Sula Richardson, Judith Schneider, and Susan Finsen.

Legislative-Executive Relations. Louis Fisher, Ronald Moe, Harold Relyea, Frederick Kaiser, Ellen Collier, Morton Rosenberg, and Roger Garcia.

Legislative-Judicial Relations. Johnny Killian. House-Senate Relations. Richard Sachs.

Information Technology for Congress. Jane Bortnick Griffith, Jeffrey Griffith, and John Kelley.

Public Understanding of Congress. Ilona Nickels, Denis Steven Rutkus, Robert Nickel, Michael Kolakowski, Liane White, and Nancy Davenport.

Clay Wellborn, the Acting Chief of the Government Division, exercised overall supervision and coordination of most of these projects.

In addition, Royce Crocker helped design and administered a survey of House and Senate Members about reform options. Karen Wirt provided editorial assistance to the committee. General reference support was provided by CRS's Ford Reference Center, Congressional Reference Division, and Library Services Division. Susan Greenwood, Barbara Schwemle, and Rick Greenwood prepared summaries of the many joint committee hearings. A useful training guide for congressional staff was prepared by Robert Newlen, Paul Boyd, Christina Noll, and Kathy Marshall.

In short, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress benefitted enormously from the assistance provided to it by the Congressional Research Service. The CRS's subject-matter experts and institutional memory about reform issues enabled the joint committee to review and analyze hundreds of reform proposals. I know I speak for all members of the joint committee on expressing our sincere appreciation to CRS for a job well done.

VFW HONORS TRUE PATRIOT,
REPUBLICAN LEADER BOB MICHEL

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1994

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, never was a man more deserving of a particular award than Republican Leader BOB MICHEL of the VFW Congressional Award, the presentation of which I had the honor to witness on March 1.

The award is presented to someone with a proven record of "fostering of true patriotism, maintaining and extending the institutions of American freedom, and preserving and defending our country from all her enemies, at home and abroad."

That, Mr. Speaker, has guided BOB MICHEL since his first election to Congress in 1956. But BOB MICHEL's defense of freedom began long before that. As a combat infantryman in World War II, BOB MICHEL earned two Bronze Stars, the Purple Heart, and four Battle Stars in France, Belgium, and Germany.

He talked about those experiences in his acceptance speech, which I proudly place in today's RECORD, yielding to the distinguished gentleman from Peoria, IL, a true American hero, House Republican Leader BOB MICHEL.

REMARKS BY HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

ROBERT H. MICHEL, VFW, MARCH 1, 1994

I am glad we meet in the presence of the winners of the Voice of Democracy Contest. These wonderful young Americans remind us that great nations survive and prosper if they retain two qualities: Memory and hope.

If we do not remember what has made our country great, we will not be able to keep our country free. If we lose hope in a better future, we will lose the optimistic American spirit that has helped our country prosper. Those of us in the older generation are filled with memories; you of the younger generation are filled with hope. We have much to learn from each other. So I am highly honored to receive this award in the presence of the best of America's past and the best of America's future.

Tonight, I speak to you out of a mixture of memory and hope. Exactly fifty years ago today, March 1, 1944, I was in England, training to be part of the invasion of Europe. On that day the war news was fairly good for the allies: American troops landed in the Admiralty Islands in the Pacific, clearing a path for the retaking of the Philippine Islands; in Europe, the Red Army continued to advance in the Baltics; the American Eighth Air Force had clear weather for attacks on the Pas-de-Calais area in France, where rumor had it the Allied invasion would come.

Rumor, of course, was wrong as usual—but the Nazis didn't know that! In Italy, our troops were being pounded, by German artillery on the Anzio beachhead. Not an extraordinary day in the war—except for those who were being killed, wounded or terrorized in combat.

I was with my Army buddies in England, getting ready for the invasion we knew would come—but we didn't know where or when. When the time came we dutifully followed orders hoping that our training, conditioning and the good Lord would sustain us. I was one of the very fortunate to survive it all from Normandy through France, Belgium and Germany up to the Battle of the Bulge when I was hit by machine gun fire and flown back to England. After my hospitalization I returned to the Continent landing at Le Havre on VE Day where there was so much shooting going on in celebration we thought the war had broken out all over again.

While we infantry dog faces were waiting to be redeployed back to the States, we had a lot of time to talk to pass the time and I remember so well our talking about keeping a strong presence in Europe to preserve the peace and guard against the next generation having to go through what we experienced. We weren't "interventionists". We weren't "internationalists". Most of us didn't know what those big words meant. All we knew was that we had seen so many of our buddies killed that we'd never let the folks back home forget.

I was fortunate for coming back, to finish college and they by chance get very actively in the political process where I could play an active role in pursuing the goals we veterans just talked about overseas.

We Veterans of Foreign Wars support a strong defense because we know freedom has to be defended anew by each generation. Although it took forty-five years, our determination to defend freedom in the Cold War

period proved to be correct. It led to our victory over Soviet Communism because the American people, for more than a generation, were willing to sacrifice lives and treasure to support freedom and stop tyranny. It is the longest sustained struggle in our history.

Some folks say we spent too much for defense during those years. I strongly disagree and would simply ask those folks how much is the survival of American freedom worth to you? Think of what has happened: the Soviet Union no longer exists. Eastern Europe, long, enslaved to Communism, is free. The threat of nuclear annihilation has not passed—but it has been significantly diminished. But I am sad to say that many Americans just take our victory for granted.

It reminds me of an old saying about our country: In times of national threat, there is unity. In times of great victory, there is euphoria. And after the victory is won, there is amnesia. We just tend to forget how difficult it is to defend freedom. We get lazy. We find the support of our military to be too burdensome. Slash the military budget! Demean military virtues! Question the very need for military strength! It happened for World War One. It happened after World War Two, and just before the war in Korea. I fear it is happening again: our nation is forgetting. But I say to you this evening: we veterans of foreign wars cannot allow it to happen again.

We do remember. And we cannot allow others to forget. Let me put our current situation in historical context—another exercise in memory: The United States of America has gone through four great periods of transition, each beginning with the conclusion of a great war:

After the American Revolution our country was in a period of transition from the birth of a nation to the growth of a nation. Some said a young, small, democratic nation could never survive. But we fooled them. After the Civil War we were changing from a primarily agricultural nation to a great industrial giant. Some said a nation of so many poor immigrants could not build a great future. But we did. After World War Two we were between the end of a hot war and the beginning of The Cold War. Some feared we would never have the staying power to outlast Soviet Communism. Tell that to Lenin's statues! And now we are at the fourth great period of national transition, a time when the world of the Cold War is dying and a new world waits to be born.

The present time is one of conflict, and of rapid change, of great promise and great tragedy. As Vaclav Havel, President of the Czech Republic said to a joint session of the Congress when he was here: "In our time, things are happening so fast, we have no time to be astonished."

Bosnia, Haiti and Somalia remind us that trouble can erupt in the most unlikely places. Think of China: huge, ambitious, the nation that will shape much of the history of the first part of the 21st century—for good or for evil. Think of the former Soviet Union, with all its problems in throwing off the old system and their hopes for emulating ours. Think of Communist North Korea with its present leadership and nuclear capability. Then there is international terrorism and the rise of militant anti-western Islamic groups.

I know there are those who say we can't afford to be prepared for these new challenges. But veterans of foreign wars can tell you that the only thing a free nation cannot afford is not to be prepared. We must remember that readiness means not only the capa-

bility of our armed forces to fight, but the determination of our people to sacrifice. We must remember that preparedness means not just technological superiority, but belief in our nation's high principles. And we must remember the litany of place-names that have helped to create and preserve this nation:

We must remember Valley Forge and Gettysburg. We must remember the trenches of France in 1918, D Day, and the Battle of the Bulge in 1944 and those fierce battles of Tarawa, Okinawa, Iwo Jima and the Coral Sea. We must remember the ice-covered hills of Korea, the steaming jungles of Vietnam, and the sands of Iraq during the Gulf War. In January of 1991, when we voted to authorize President Bush to use force in the Persian Gulf, I led the bi-partisan House coalition in supporting that resolution. And I can tell you it was a moment of great anguish for me personally as well as great pride.

I knew I was sending young men and women into combat and I remembered that I had nothing to say but to follow orders when I was a young man. Here I had come full circle, thrust now in the role of making the agonizing decision to send others to war with all the uncertainties of how many casualties would be on my conscience and how well or how badly our game plan would be executed. It was a wrenching experience, the single toughest decision I have ever had to make as a congressman. But it was the right decision.

Thanks to the American people, whose sacrifices gave us the technology and the arms and the best military in the world, we won that conflict. Now here we are facing a new world whose shape we cannot yet discern and whose challenges we cannot yet know. But tonight I have good reason to hope our country can master these challenges—and give shape to the world of the 21st century. And the reason that hope is so strong is the generation symbolized by our Voice of Democracy winners here tonight.

So in conclusion, let me say to our younger folks: You see before you a proud grandfather. The war I fought is so distant from your experiences. It was in another age, another world. So it may seem we have little in common. But fifty years ago tonight, as I lay on my cot in England, knowing we were preparing to invade Fortress Europe, I was barely out of my teens. I dreamed the same kind of dreams you dream—about the future, about hopes, about memories, about loved ones. And so did my buddies, but I must say our hopes and our dreams at the time were tethered by the fear, anxiety and apprehension of what the future held for each of us.

I had the good fortune to return and to try to make those hopes become reality. But so very many of my friends never got the chance. I have never forgotten them. And their great sacrifice reminds me: In every generation, young Americans have dreamed the dreams of youth and of hope. But when the time came to defend our nation, they have done their duty to protect freedom. I know in my heart your generation will continue that great tradition.

So as I accept this great honor tonight, I do so in memory of the fallen, of all our buddies who did not come back from all the wars—but I also receive it as a symbol of hope, of hope in the courage, the faith and the patriotism of a great new generation of Americans like all of you. Out of such memories, out of such hope, I am certain our nation will continue to be strong and proud and free.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, March 8, 1994, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 9

9:15 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation to reorganize the Department of Agriculture.

SR-332

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To continue hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense and the future years defense plan, focusing on force structure levels in the Bottom Up Review; to be followed by a closed business meeting to discuss and consider certain nomination matters.

SR-222

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for conservation programs of the Department of Energy.

SD-138

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To resume hearings on proposed legislation to consolidate certain Federal agencies which regulate and supervise depository institutions insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

SD-538

Budget

To resume hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1995 budget for the Federal Government, focusing on defense.

SD-608

Finance

To resume hearings to examine the results of the Uruguay Round trade negotiations, focusing on the Agreement on

Subsidies and Countervailing Measures.

SD-215

Judiciary

Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the operation of the Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce.

SD-226

Labor and Human Resources

Aging Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the Administration's proposed Health Security Act, to establish comprehensive health care for every American, focusing on women's health care coverage.

SD-430

Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 1995 for Indian programs within the Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Education, and Labor, and the Administration of Native Americans.

SR-485

2:00 p.m.

Budget

To hold hearings to review the Department of Defense's roles and missions.

SD-608

Environment and Public Works

Clean Air and Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine Nuclear Regulatory Commission user fees.

SD-406

MARCH 10

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings on the nomination of John M. Deutch, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

SR-222

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To resume hearings on S. 1822, to safeguard and protect the public interest while permitting the growth and development of new communications technologies.

SR-253

Rules and Administration

To resume hearings on S. 1824, to improve the operations of the legislative branch of the Federal Branch, focusing on Title I, relating to the Standing Rules of the Senate.

SR-301

Small Business

To hold hearings to examine the impact of health care reform on the small business sector.

SR-428A

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the United States Navy and Marine Corps.

SD-192

Appropriations

Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation.

SD-138

Finance

To resume hearings to examine health care reform issues, focusing on health care cost containment.

SD-215

Foreign Relations

To hold open and closed hearings on the Administration's proposal to seek modification of the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

SD-419

Judiciary

To hold hearings on the nomination of Deval L. Patrick, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

SD-226

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine how the conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina has affected the children of the region.

SD-562

11:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine methods for improving job training, focusing on the creation of a national employment training system.

SD-430

2:00 p.m.

Armed Services

To resume joint hearings with the Committee on Governmental Affairs on S. 1587, to revise and streamline the acquisition laws of the Federal Government.

SD-G50

Governmental Affairs

To resume joint hearings with the Committee on Armed Services on S. 1587, to revise and streamline the acquisition laws of the Federal Government.

SD-G50

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on proposed budget requests for fiscal year 1995 for veterans' programs.

SR-418

2:30 p.m.

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings to examine the Employee Retirement Income Security Act's (ERISA) preemption of State prevailing wage laws.

SD-430

Select on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.

SH-219

MARCH 11

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine Federal policies governing the introduction of non-indigenous plants and animal species.

SD-342

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-138

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the United States Secret Service and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, both of the Department of the Treasury, the Financial Crimes En-

forcement Network, and the General Services Administration.

SD-116

MARCH 14

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To resume hearings on S. 1822, to safeguard and protect the public interest while permitting the growth and development of new communications technologies.

SR-253

MARCH 15

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the United States Army.

SD-192

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

SD-116

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Office of the Attorney General.

S-146, Capitol

Finance

To resume hearings to examine health care reform issues, focusing on premiums and subsidies.

SD-215

2:00 p.m.

Governmental Affairs

To resume hearings to examine Federal policies governing the introduction of non-indigenous plants and animal species.

SD-342

2:30 p.m.

Armed Services

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense and the future years defense program.

SR-222

MARCH 16

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine how proposals to improve the dairy program will affect dairy trade.

SR-332

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-192

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on the domestic and international implications of energy demand growth in China and the developing countries of the Pacific Rim.

SD-366

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for Small Community and Rural Development,

Farmers Home Administration, and Rural Electrification Administration, all of the Department of Agriculture.

SD-138

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of State.

S-146, Capitol

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, and the Office of Personnel Management.

SD-116

2:00 p.m.

Armed Services

To resume joint hearings with the Committee on Governmental Affairs on S. 1587, to revise and streamline the acquisition laws of the Federal Government.

SD-106

Governmental Affairs

To resume joint hearings with the Committee on Armed Services on S. 1587, to revise and streamline the acquisition laws of the Federal Government.

SD-106

2:30 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings on competition in the U.S. biotechnology industry.

SR-253

MARCH 17

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-116

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine contract and financial management at the Department of Energy.

SD-342

Rules and Administration

To resume hearings on S. 1824, to improve the operations of the legislative branch of the Federal Branch, focusing on Title I, relating to the Standing rules of the Senate.

SR-301

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the Jewish War Veterans, the Blinded Veterans Association, and Non Commissioned Officers Association.

345 Cannon Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the United States Air Force.

SD-192

Appropriations

VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the National Science Foundation, and the Office of Science Technology Policy.

SD-124

Appropriations

Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Office of Inspector General, Department of Transportation, and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

SD-138

Finance

To resume hearings to examine health care reform issues, focusing on premiums and subsidies.

SD-215

MARCH 22

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Education.

SD-138

Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on water and sanitation issues in rural Alaska.

SR-485

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, focusing on manpower and personnel programs.

SD-116

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Commerce.

S-146, Capitol

MARCH 23

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

SD-138

2:30 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine science and technology policy issues.

SR-253

MARCH 24

9:00 a.m.

Office of Technology Assessment Board meeting, to consider pending business.

EF-100, Capitol

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Labor.

SD-138

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the effect of the Administration's Superfund reauthorization proposals on the Department of Energy's Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Program.

SD-366

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the AMVETS, American Ex-Prisoners of War, Vietnam Veterans of America, Veterans of World War I, Association of the U.S. Army, The Retired Officers Association, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart.

345 Cannon Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for National Guard and Reserve programs, focusing on manpower and equipment requirements and the restructuring of brigades.

SD-116

Appropriations

VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

SD-124

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, and the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (AMTRAK).

SD-138

MARCH 25

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Office of Management and Budget, and the Executive Office of the President.

SD-116

APRIL 11

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for Marketing and Inspection Services, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Food Safety and Inspection Service, and Agricultural Marketing Service, all of the Department of Agriculture.

SD-138

APRIL 12

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold closed hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, focusing on classified programs.

S-407, Capitol

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce.

S-146, Capitol

APRIL 13

9:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 1995 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

SR-485

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Energy, focusing on fossil energy and clean coal programs.

SD-116

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.

SD-138

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the United States Postal Service.

SD-192

APRIL 14

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on the operating and economic environment of the domestic natural gas and oil industry.

SD-366

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, focusing on health services and infrastructure.

SD-192

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Drug Enforcement Administration, both of the Department of Justice.

S-146, Capitol

APRIL 18

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for Science and Education, Agricultural Research Service, Cooperative State Research

Service, Extension Service, and Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization, all of the Department of Agriculture.

SD-138

APRIL 19

9:30 a.m.
Rules and Administration
To resume hearings on S. 1824, to improve the operations of the legislative branch of the Federal Branch, focusing on Subtitle A, Parts I and II of Title III, relating to Congressional biennial budgeting and additional budget process changes.

SR-301

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, focusing on strategic programs.

SD-192

APRIL 20

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of the Treasury.

SD-116

APRIL 21

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold closed hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, focusing on intelligence programs.

S-407, Capitol

Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SD-106

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.

S-128, Capitol

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission.

S-146, Capitol

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation.

SD-138

APRIL 25

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for International Affairs and Commodity Programs, Natural Resources and Environment, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Foreign Agriculture Service, Soil Conservation Service, and Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, all of the Department of Agriculture.

SD-138

APRIL 26

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold closed hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, focusing on National Foreign Intelligence Programs (NFIP) and Tactical Intelligence and Related Activities (TIARA).

S-407, Capitol

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Office of Justice Programs, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, both of the Department of Justice.

S-146, Capitol

APRIL 27

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, and the Washington Metro Transit Authority.

SD-138

APRIL 28

9:30 a.m.
Rules and Administration
To resume hearings on S. 1824, to improve the operations of the legislative branch of the Federal Branch, focusing on Subtitle A, Parts I and II of Title III, relating to Congressional biennial budgeting and additional budget process changes.

SR-301

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Council on Environmental Quality.

SD-106

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the United States Information Agency.

S-146, Capitol

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.

SD-116

MAY 3
9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on Boron-Neutron Cancer Therapy.
SD-366

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for Food and Consumer Services, Food and Nutrition Service, and Human Nutrition Information Service, all of the Department of Agriculture.
SD-138

Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, focusing on defense conversion programs.
SD-192

MAY 5
10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Legal Services Corporation.
S-146, Capitol

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the National Transportation Safety Board, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation.
SD-138

MAY 10
10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Farm Credit Administration, and the Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.
SD-138

MAY 11
10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Na-

tional Park Service, Department of the Interior.
S-128, Capitol

MAY 12
10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Corporation for National and Community Service.
SD-106

MAY 17
10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, focusing on the Pacific Rim, NATO, and peacekeeping programs.
SD-192

MAY 19
10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense.
SD-192

Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Selective Service System.
SD-106

MAY 20
9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies.
SD-138

MAY 25
10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of the Interior.
S-128, Capitol

MAY 26
10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
SD-106

JUNE 8
10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Energy.
S-128, Capitol

JULY 19
10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense.
SD-192

CANCELLATIONS

MARCH 16
9:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1876, to revise the Solid Waste Disposal Act to grant State status to Indian tribes for purposes of the enforcement of such Act.
SR-485

POSTPONEMENTS

MARCH 11
10:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to reauthorize the Earthquake Assistance Program.
SR-253